

**2833**

**CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WASTE PIT AREA  
REMOVAL ACTION REVISED WORK PLAN**

**DOCUMENT DATE 02-05-92**



State of Ohio, Environmental Protection Agency

**Southwest District Office**

40 South Main Street  
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2086  
(513) 285-6357  
FAX (513) 285-6249

2833

George V. Voinovich  
Governor

February 5, 1992

Re: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL  
WASTE PIT AREA REMOVAL ACTION  
REVISED W.P.

Mr. Jack R. Craig  
Project Manager  
U.S. DOE FEMP  
P.O. Box 398705  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45239

Date Rec'd FEB 10 1992

Log F-1729

File

Library

Dear Mr. Craig:

The purpose of this letter is to conditionally approve the Waste Pit Area Stormwater Runoff Control Removal Action Revised Work Plan. The conditions are that DOE address to Ohio EPA's satisfaction the comments listed below:

Response to Comments

1. Specific Comment # 2: a) The data submitted in its present form, without detection limits and a summary of the statistical procedures used for non-detects, is insufficient to support DOE's position of uniform contamination. The data available, at best will only provide insight into the relative uniform contamination across the Waste Pit Area. If the data show that specific contamination across OU1 is consistent, then DOE could store soil with the same contamination within OU1. Since the soil could still be considered a solid waste under Ohio law, it would have to be stored in a manner to prevent erosion by wind and water until such time as final risk-based cleanup standards are developed. b) DOE must define how TCLP data will determine if the soils are a solid waste under RCRA. Specific guidelines should be stated within the text of the work plan. Additionally, TCLP will not analyze for some contaminants which would make the soil a solid waste under Ohio law.

Sampling and Analysis Plan

1. Page 2, Excess Soil Sampling and Disposition: This section fails to include any process for determining if the soils are a solid waste either under Ohio law or by RCRA (See DOE Response to Ohio EPA Specific Comment #2). The SAP must address the potential for the soil to be a solid waste. Soil excavated under this removal action and "uniformly

8028


Mr. Jack R. Craig  
U.S. DOE FEMP  
February 5, 1992  
Page Two

contaminated" with other OU1 soils should be stockpiled within OU1 in such a manner as to prevent erosion. The soil can not be released for unrestricted use.

2. Page 3, Excess Soil Sampling and Disposition, First Bullet: As stated in previous Ohio EPA comments, DOE must prevent the spread of contamination from one area of the site to another by the release of soil for fill. The use of contaminated soil, which is considered a solid waste, constitutes "fill," which is prohibited by Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) 3745-27-13 without prior authorization for the Ohio EPA director. DOE has not shown that contamination by HSL constituents is uniform across the site both area-wide and vertically and until such time as that is the case soil should not be released for unrestricted use.

If you have any questions about these comments please contact me.

Sincerely,



Graham E. Mitchell  
Project Manager

GEM/acn

cc: Section Manager, DERR, T&PSS  
Jim Saric, U.S. EPA  
Lisa August, GeoTrans  
Ed Schuessler, PRC  
Robert Owen, ODH